

REMARKS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the courteous telephone interview extended to Mr. Stephen Beuerle and Mr. Alvin Fashu-Kanu on June 25, 2008. A Summary of Interview, pursuant to MPEP 713.04, is provided herein.

The present amendment is in response to the Final Office Action dated May 13, 2008. In the present amendment, claims 1, 10 and 16 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-8 and 10-20 are pending in the present application with claims 1, 10 and 16 being the independent claims. Reconsideration and allowance of pending claims 1-8 and 10-20 in view of the amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Summary of Interview Pursuant to MPEP 713.04**(A) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted**

There was no exhibit shown or demonstration conducted.

(B) Identification of the claims discussed

Claim 1 was discussed.

(C) Identification of specific prior art discussed

U.S. Publication No. 2003/0222853 A1 to Kim ("Kim") and U.S. Patent No. 6,047,196A to Makela et al. (Makela) were discussed.

(D) Identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary form completed by the examiner.

Above claim 1 was primarily discussed and it was agreed that the above amendments to claims 1, 10 and 16 distinguish the claims from Kim and Makela, and should put the claims in condition for allowance.

(E) The general thrust of the principal arguments of the applicant and the examiner should also be identified, even where the interview is initiated by the examiner. The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner

The general thrust of the principal argument for allowability of claim 1 is that neither Kim nor Makela disclose, teach, or suggest, among other things, a mobile phone, the mobile phone including an upper phone member with a display and a lower phone member, the mobile phone comprising:

an alphanumeric keypad, the alphanumeric keypad including a left set of one or more rows of alphanumeric input keys and a right set of one or more rows of alphanumeric input keys separated by a centerline, the left set of one or more rows of – alphanumeric input keys including a top row with a right-most key, the right set of one or more rows of alphanumeric input keys including a top row with a left-most key, and the

right-most key of the top row of the left set of one or more rows of alphanumeric input keys being immediately adjacent to the left-most key of the top row of the right set of one or more rows of alphanumeric input keys, the left set of one or more rows of alphanumeric input keys arranged in one or more respective arcs having one or more respective arc centers located to the left of the centerline, and the right set of one or more rows of alphanumeric input keys arranged in one or more respective arcs having one or more respective arc centers located to the right of the centerline; and

a numeric keypad including a plurality of phone number input keys that together are arranged in a rectangular configuration for entering phone numbers ~~entered below~~, and distinct from, the left and right sets of one or more rows of alphanumeric input keys, wherein the left set of one or more rows of alphanumeric input keys and the right set of one or more rows of alphanumeric input keys are sandwiched between the display and the numeric keypad.

(F) A general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed

No other pertinent matters were discussed.

(G) If appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview

It was agreed that the above amendments to claims 1, 10 and 16 distinguish the claims from Kim and Makela and all other references cited in the office action, and should put the claims in condition for allowance.

H) In the case of an interview via electronic mail, a paper copy of the Internet e-mail contents MUST be made and placed in the patent application file as required by the Federal Records Act in the same manner as an Examiner Interview Summary Form, PTOL 413, is entered.

The subject telephone interview was telephonic, making this requirement moot.

A. Objection to Drawings

In regard to this objection, enclosed is a replacement drawing sheet 1 including a corrected version of Figure 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

B. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph (Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10, 11 and 13-20)

In regard to these rejections, the claims have been amended to comply with the requirements of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

C. Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) (Claims 1, 4-8, 10, 13-16 and 18-20; Kim)

Claims 1, 4-8, 10, 13-16 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kim US 2003/0222853 A1 (Kim). Pursuant to the telephone interview with the Examiner on June 25 2008, Applicant respectfully submits that Kim does not anticipate the amended claims. Amended independent claim 1 recites,

an alphanumeric keypad, the alphanumeric keypad including a left set of one or more rows of alphanumeric input keys and a right set of one or more rows of alphanumeric input keys separated by a centerline, the left set of one or more rows of alphanumeric input keys including a top row

with a right-most key, the right set of one or more rows of alphanumeric input keys including a top row with a left-most key, and the right-most key of the top row of the left set of one or more rows of alphanumeric input keys being immediately adjacent to the left-most key of the top row of the right set of one or more rows of alphanumeric input keys, the left set of one or more rows of alphanumeric input keys arranged in one or more respective arcs having one or more respective arc centers located to the left of the centerline, and the right set of one or more rows of alphanumeric input keys arranged in one or more respective arcs having one or more respective arc centers located to the right of the centerline.

Kim is cited (fig. 2, upper-left oval key and 123, upper-right oval key and 124) for describing a left set of one or more rows of input keys and a right set of one or more rows of input keys separated by a centerline. However, the keys disclosed in Kim represent a navigation keypad that is disposed at the front upper portion of the mobile handset and used for function manipulation. Kim describes the keys as "the up, down, left and right direction keys 121, 122, 123 and 124" of the navigational keypad 120 respectively. The navigational keys "become left, right, down and up direction keys in relation to the new orientation of the image" (see Kim, paragraph 37). On the other hand, claim 1 is amended to emphasize that the input keys are alphanumeric. Claim 1 recites, "an alphanumeric keypad, the alphanumeric keypad including a left set of one or more rows of alphanumeric input keys and a right set of one or more rows of alphanumeric input keys separated by a centerline." (see Fig. 2; page 2, paragraph 15-20, page 3, paragraph 14-21, page 5, paragraph 16-22 of the specification).

In addition, Kim is cited (Fig. 2; 110) for describing "the right-most key of the top row of the left set of one or more rows of input keys being immediately adjacent to the left-most key of the top row of the right set of one or more rows of input keys, the left set of one or more rows of input keys arranged in one or more respective arcs having one or more respective arc centers located to the left of the centerline, and the right set of one or more rows of input keys arranged in one or more respective arcs having one or more respective arc centers located to the right of the centerline; and a substantially rectangular numeric keypad." On the contrary, claim 1 as amended emphasizes that the rows of input keys are alphanumeric.

Claim 1 further distinguishes from Kim in that the numeric keypad is distinct from the alphanumeric keypad. Claim 1 recites that "a numeric keypad including a plurality of phone number input keys that together are arranged in a rectangular configuration for entering phone numbers, and distinct from, the left and right sets of one or more rows of alphanumeric input keys, wherein the left set of one or more rows of alphanumeric input keys and the right set of one or more rows of alphanumeric input keys are sandwiched between the display and the numeric keypad." Thus, in claim 1, the numeric keypad is distinct from the alphanumeric keypad.

Further, the keypad disclosed in Kim is a numeric rotating keypad. The rotating keypad changes the viewing orientation of the display and subsequently changes the orientation of the keys 121-124 of the navigation keypad. Even if the navigation keypad and the numeric keypad were alphanumeric, Kim fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the other limitations of claim 1. For example, in regard to the navigational keys, Kim only discloses a set of four keys that are insufficient for an alphanumeric keypad. Also

the numeric keypad disclosed in Kim includes a plurality phone number input keys that together are arranged in a rectangular configuration. Claim 1, on the contrary, recites that "the left set of one or more rows of alphanumeric input keys including a top row with a right-most key, the right set of one or more rows of alphanumeric input keys including a top row with a left-most key, and the right-most key of the top row of the left set of one or more rows of alphanumeric input keys being immediately adjacent to the left-most key of the top row of the right set of one or more rows of alphanumeric input keys, the left set of one or more rows of alphanumeric input keys arranged in one or more respective arcs having one or more respective arc centers located to the left of the centerline."

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Kim fails to anticipate amended claim 1 because Kim does not disclose, teach, or suggest the limitations of claim 1. Independent claims 10 and 16 include similar amendments to those made in claim 1. Dependent claims 4-8, 13-15, and 18-20 add further limitations to independent claims 1, 10, and 16. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Kim also fails to anticipate claims 4-8, 10, 13-16 and 18-20. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

D. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) (Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10, 11, 13-20; Makela)

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10, 11 and 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Makela et al. US 6,047,196 A (hereinafter "Makela"). Pursuant to the telephone interview with the Examiner on June 25 2008, Applicant respectfully

submits that the amended claims are not obvious with respect to Makela because Makela does not disclose, teach, or suggest the limitations of these claims.

Similar to Kim, Makela fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "an alphanumeric keypad, the alphanumeric keypad including a left set of one or more rows of alphanumeric input keys and a right set of one or more rows of alphanumeric input keys separated by a centerline, the left set of one or more rows of alphanumeric input keys including a top row with a right-most key, the right set of one or more rows of alphanumeric input keys including a top row with a left-most key" and that "the left set of one or more rows of alphanumeric input keys arranged in one or more respective arcs having one or more respective arc centers located to the left of the centerline, and the right set of one or more rows of alphanumeric input keys arranged in one or more respective arcs having one or more respective arc centers located to the right of the centerline."

While Makela discloses an alphanumeric display, the alphanumeric display is a typical rectangular alphanumeric display. Much like Kim, the only aspect of the mobile device in Makela that appears to have an arc-like feature is the navigational or control keys, which as described previously are different from the alphanumeric keys recited in claim 1.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is not obvious over Makela because Makela fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the limitations of claim 1. Independent claims 10 and 16 include similar amendments to those made in claim 1. Dependent claims 2, 4-8, 11, 13-15, and 17-20 add further limitations to independent claims 1, 10, and 16. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2, 4-8, 10, 11, and 13-20 are also

not obvious over Makela. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

E. Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) (Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10, 11 and 13-20; Makela/Hughes/Kang)

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10, 11 and 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Makela in view of Hughes et al. US 5,754,655 A (Hughes) and Kang US 2003/0063070A1 (Kang). The addition of Hughes and Kang fail to cure the defects of Makela described above. The combination of references does not yield all of the limitations set forth in claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10, 11 and 13-20. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10, 11 and 13-20 are not obvious over Makela in view of Hughes and Kang. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For all the foregoing reasons, allowance of claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10, 11, and 13-20 is respectfully requested. Applicant respectfully does not acquiesce to any of the positions set forth in the Office Action of May 13, 2008. If necessary, Applicant requests, under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) to extend the period for filing a reply in the above-identified application and to charge the fees for a large entity under 37 CFR 1.17(a). The Director is authorized to charge any additional fee(s) or any underpayment of fee(s) or credit any overpayment(s) to Deposit Account No. 50-3001 of Kyocera Wireless Corp.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: July 17, 2008

/George W. Luckhardt/
George W. Luckhardt
Reg. No. 50,519

George W. Luckhardt
Kyocera Wireless Corp.
Attn: Patent Department
P.O. Box 928289
San Diego, California 92192-8289
Tel: (858) 882-2593
Fax: (858) 882-2485